

EMI IN INDONESIAN HIGHER EDUCATION: STAKEHOLDERS' PERSPECTIVES

Nurmala Elmin Simbolon

(n.simbolon@postgrad.curtin.edu.au)

Politeknik Negeri Pontianak

Jl. Ahmad Yani, Pontianak, West Kalimantan, Indonesia, 78124

Abstract: Many universities in Indonesia are striving towards becoming internationally renowned universities. Partly, they do so by making English as Medium of Instruction (EMI). The university where the study was conducted commenced EMI through its voluntary EMI programs, which lasted for four years. The discontinuation of the EMI programs was the trigger of this study. This article seeks to understand the stakeholders' perspectives of EMI. Data were gathered from two focus group interviews involving six content-based lecturers and three policy makers in one state university which utilises EMI approach in their course delivery, and then analysed using thematic and content analysis methods. The findings demonstrate that while the stakeholders agree that mastery of English is important for their university graduates, there was a gap between policy makers' perspectives and the articulation of the institutional policy concerning the significance of English proficiency in the department's curriculum. Yet, the stakeholders admit that there is possibility that EMI can be implemented in several relevant departments in the university. The interviews also reveal that stakeholders consider content-based language teaching (CBLT), practised by language specialists, as the most suitable approach should EMI be implemented throughout their university. Finally, this article concludes with further EMI implications for university planning of its English language teaching.

Keywords: EMI, content and language integrated learning (CLIL), content-based language teaching (CBLT), higher education

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v29i1/108-128>

EMI is a model of bilingual teaching in which some of the curriculum content is taught in English, which is not students' first language (Baker, 2011). In European and Asian contexts, EMI is also known as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) (see Aguilar, 2015; Arnó-Macià & Mancho-Barés, 2015; Coyle, Hood & Marsh, 2010; Doiz, Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2013; Lin, 2015; Yang, 2015). Although CLIL allows the use of languages other than English, in fact, English is the most popular language being used in this approach to learning. Generally, CLIL is "an educational approach in which various language-supportive methodologies are used which lead to a dual-focused form of instruction where attention is given to both the language and the content" (Coyle et al., 2010, p. 3). For the purpose of this paper, the term used is "EMI".

Globalization has triggered the use of English as a means of communication in many international contexts. One reason for this phenomenon is the fact that the majority of the information in scientific, technological, and academic fields stored in electronic systems, is in English; thus, people from non-English-speaking background need English skills to access it (Ammon, 2001). Furthermore, English has become the language dominating economic and entertainment activities (Crystal, 1997). This is further enhanced by the growing number of internet-based activities conducted in English (Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011). Finally, English has reached its popularity by the growing trend of using EMI at higher education in the countries, which intend to improve their citizens' English proficiency and to attract international students (Doiz et al., 2013). In short, with the improved English through EMI, this skill is believed to be a golden ticket to a global world (Dearden, 2015).

European universities have implemented EMI as a result of the Bologna Process, which was initiated in 1999. One of the reasons for the Process was for students' mobility in an evolving labour market in this region. There was a significant increase in the number of English-taught programs (ETPs) in Europe within seven years. It went up from about 2,400 in 2007 to approximately 8,000 in the next seven years (Wachter & Maiworm, 2014).

In Asia, approximately 150,000 international students were admitted in Japanese universities in 2011 (Hou, Morse, Chiang & Chen, 2013). Welch (in Hou et al., 2013) states that Taiwan, supported by its top country leader, attempts to enrol more than 100,000 international students by 2020.

Indonesia is at its early stage in the competition of this particular educational practice. ASEAN Economic Community (MEA onwards) is one of the

triggers. One of the four MEA supporting foundations is ‘Free flow of goods, service, investment, capital and skilled labour’ (ASEAN, 2015, p. 4). Many policy makers, including the Indonesian Minister of Research and Technology and Higher Education (*Menteri Riset dan Teknologi dan Pendidikan Tinggi*, or Menristekdikti) interpret the phrase ‘free flow’ in this pillar as a borderless region, through which an international language is utilised (Nasir, 2015).

EMI approach is not new in Indonesia and it has been implemented in various ways. A number of private universities in the countries have been implementing it in their international classes (Simbolon, 2016). The University of Ciputra has been implementing EMI in its Double Degree Program in International Business Management. The University of Kristen Satya Wacana offers an EMI program for its Indonesian Arts course. State universities that offer EMI programs include Gadjah Mada University, University of Indonesia, and Padjadjaran University (Gill & Kirkpatrick, 2013).

Unlike the private universities, the state universities are required to have *Badan Hukum Milik Negara* (BHMN, state-owned institutions) status to offer such classes. BHMN status is granted by Indonesian government through a government regulation. In 2000, there were four universities granted the BHMN status. They are the University of Indonesia, Gadjah Mada University, Bogor Agricultural University, and Bandung Institute of Technology. Since then more universities have received this status. These universities have made some efforts by adopting boards of stakeholder management systems. These boards promoted autonomy for university managers, which allow them to be more flexible in designing their curricula to meet this global need.

In addition to introducing ‘international classes’ programs, other universities such as Semarang State University, and Medan State University, have introduced bilingual classes (Simbolon, 2016). Bilingual classes are intended to provide a foundation for students wishing to transition to international classes. Unlike international classes, the practice of bilingual classes is less demanding in terms of the necessary infrastructure required. For example, the bilingual classes at the target university are voluntarily and only offered by some lecturers who have sufficient English proficiency. In addition, the entry requirements for such classes are less demanding than for international classes. For example, the Faculty of Mathematics and Science at State University of Medan requires students to have at least 400 points of TOEFL score to qualify for admission in the bilingual program; the minimum English proficiency requirement is still below the score required for the international classes (i.e., minimum 500

TOEFL scores) (Simbolon, 2016). Further, because of the limited English language skills of both students and teachers, EMI practice in bilingual classes in the target university adopts only partial English instruction (Simbolon, 2017).

Utama University (pseudonym), where this study was conducted, henceforth referred as ‘the University’, is a state university in Indonesia. The vocational-based university has eight departments: Accounting, Business, Agricultural Technology, Architecture and Planning, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Civil Engineering and Planning, and Fisheries and Oceanography Sciences. The university intends to open an EMI program in order to achieve its goal in becoming an internationally recognised vocational university by 2020. The university has started establishing international networks and cooperation with educational institutions abroad including in Malaysia, France, Hawaii, and the USA. The memoranda of understandings (MoUs) between the university and these foreign universities are declarations of agreement of potential future cooperation between both parties in terms of collaborative research projects as well as exchange programs for students and lecturers. The interaction between the members of these institutions (students and lecturers) is anticipated to be in English.

Following the internationalization goal, voluntary EMI programs have already commenced since 2010 in several departments. In 2010, the School of Information and Technology (IT) in the Electrical Engineering Department and the Business Administration Department became the first to open an EMI program. The Accounting Department followed suit in 2012. English was the medium of instruction in these programs. Students and lecturers involved in these EMI programs were expected to interact in English. These EMI programs, however, ended in 2014. Despite this abrupt ending, EMI practice is *de facto* at the university. Several individual lecturers are still practicing EMI in their classes. This discontinuation of the EMI programs has inspired the author to question the reasons behind and the implications of the decision to end the program.

Some studies in the area of EMI practice in higher education included problems encountered by the students (Joe & Lee, 2013), by the teachers (Airey, 2011; Werther, Denver, Jensen, & Mees, 2014), and the benefits of EMI (Aguilar, 2015; Floris, 2014; Arnó-Macià & Mancho-Barés, 2015). Problems faced by the students in Joe and Lee’s (2013) study suggest certain standard of English proficiency required for the EMI classes (Joe & Lee, 2013). Their study shows that students with sufficient English proficiency (approximately 590 of Paper-Based TOEFL) found it challenging to participate in EMI

classes. EMI lecturers also experienced similar issue. Many teachers in the study conducted by Airey (2011) and Werther et al. (2014) articulated their challenges in switching between languages, arranging EMI learning materials and providing feedback for the students in EMI classes. However, some studies indicated teachers' more positive perceptions of advantages of EMI. They viewed that EMI practice might improve their own (Floris, 2014) and students' English skills (Aguilar, 2015; Arnó-Macià & Mancho-Barés, 2015).

Apart from these practical issues in EMI classrooms, other studies focused on language-in-education policies. Hamid, Nguyen, and Baldauf Jr.'s study (2013) examined the policy and practice of medium of instruction (MOI) in ten Asian countries (secondary school and tertiary levels). Their study found that at the macro-policy level in many of the countries MOI is considered a relatively simple and affordable solution to both the problems of higher education internationalization and of upgraded local students' English proficiency. This may be the case where detailed language planning provisions are made (such as in the Vietnam), but in most other countries insufficient resources and a lack of attention to the language planning details tend to lead to less desired outcome (Hamid et al., 2013).

Hu and Lei (2014) conducted a case study in a major university of finance and economy in mainland China. Generating national/institutional policy statements and the transcripts of interviews with professors and students, their study sought to uncover EMI-related language ideologies, language practices, and language management mechanisms. The findings show a considerable misalignment between policy intentions and actual practices in the classroom (Hu & Lei, 2014).

In Malaysia, Zaaba, Aning, Gunggut, Ramadan, and Umemoto (2010) demonstrate that language in education policy was strongly influenced by the highly centralised top-down system in Malaysia, globalization, and colonialism. The policy was initially to address the problem of unemployed graduates due to their limited English skills (Zaaba et al, 2010). However, no systematic planning was made to follow up the initiative.

Another study in Malaysia was conducted by Ali (2013), which disclosed that the national language policy goals were not described by the policy makers to middle, or university level and micro level. She also found that the lack of the explicit status of English as the medium of instruction did not retard the macro level from its implementation. However, this limited clarity of the EMI

status has impacted the EMI policy circulation and consequently micro implementation.

In Indonesia, currently there is no specific written regulation of EMI in higher education. The formal organization and arrangement of the education system is outlined in the Law of National Education No 20/2003. This Law describes the arrangement of the Indonesian education system from primary education to higher education, which bears no emphasis of the arrangement of English language as the medium of instruction in educational institutions. Furthermore, this specific regulation for higher education outlined in Law of Higher Education No 12/2012, has no explicit mention about having English courses in the university curriculum either. But the inclusion of English language instruction in the higher education curriculum is supported by Article 37 of the same Law, which advises universities to adopt one foreign language in the universities. Globalization and the need for English in the workplace, which is often used internationally as the lingua franca, seem to be the reasons why the majority of universities in Indonesia choose to include English language courses in their curriculum (Simbolon, 2016).

The most current articulation of EMI practice in higher education institutions in Indonesia was raised by the Indonesian Menristekdikti in 2015 (Simbolon, 2016). The Minister described EMI program as a 'bilingual curriculum' (Nasir, 2015). Yet, in another official occasion, he used another term to describe it as a 'dual language' program (Nasir, 2015). Despite the different terms that he used, his support was unequivocal when he stated that universities should accommodate MEA through the adoption of a 'bilingual curriculum' (Nasir, 2015).

Nevertheless, there is a dearth of reported investigation in language-in-education policy in higher education in Indonesia. Further, the discontinuation of voluntary pilot program at my research context is important to investigate to delve into this case. This study also sought to examine how arrangement regarding EMI in the University was made. This effort was done by focusing on the examination of both university content-based lecturers and authorities' perspectives on EMI in an Indonesian university. The investigation of documents of current University curriculum was also conducted.

The research questions examined in the study were:

1. What are the lecturers' and authorities' perspectives on the rationales for and support to be available for the implementation of EMI at the university?
2. What does current policy of the University state about EMI?

METHOD

This qualitative case study was conducted at Utama University in 2015. Following the case study design and methods suggested by Yin (2009), I carried out the research procedures within sixteen months. It utilised focus groups interview method in gathering relevant information regarding the stakeholders' views on EMI practice. One of the advantages of conducting focus group interviews, according to Creswell (2012), is that the interactions can yield rich information from the participants. This method was strengthened by purposefully grouping the participants according to common characteristics, which allowed issues relevant to the context to be elicited. One group consisted of a group of lecturers who have practised EMI in their courses, and the other was a group of the University authorities having responsibilities relevant to EMI.

In conducting focus group interviews, Krueger and Casey (2009) warn that there are potential problems especially of timing and scheduling. During the period of data collection for this study, some participants, especially the University authorities, had very limited time for interviews. Another challenge was that the focus group interviews at times elicited trivial or simple answers—something about which other researchers have cautioned. I had anticipated this problem by sending follow up emails to participants to seek for clarification on issues raised during the focus group interviews. The follow up interaction also allowed participants to add more information to the researcher.

Key informants for the focus group interviews were identified to obtain the maximum quality of information. There were nine participants in total. Table 1 illustrates the make-up of these focus groups. Group One consisted of six lecturers, who had considerable experience with EMI teaching (ranging from two to four years of full time practice). There were three university-level policy makers in Group Two. They were the Director of the University, the University Vice Director of external affairs coordinating cooperation matters, and the University International Office Coordinator.

The data collection was conducted as follows. Firstly, lecturer-participants were purposively selected and recruited based on their EMI experience, English proficiency and, for the authority-focus group, the selection was based on the relevance of their role within the institution. Next, permission to participate in the study was obtained from all the participants. To do this, the participants were provided with copies of an information letter explaining the purpose and

the procedure of the study. Signed consent was then sought and gained from each of the participants prior to the commencement of the study.

Next, focus group interviews were conducted. Group One was interviewed first. After analysing their responses, the other group was interviewed, which was about six months later. For the comfort of the participants, and to ensure quality data, all interviews were conducted in Indonesian. Some participants did respond in English. Once the data were collected, they were transcribed, and an English translation was made by the researcher. The translation for the purpose of this paper was proofread by a proficient academic staff member from an Australian university.

Key questions in the interviews include the participants' understanding of EMI practice regarding the rationales and the support to be available to implement EMI practice at the University. Further, the responses, especially from participants in Group Two, were augmented with current arrangement of program curriculum within the University.

Table 1. Focus Group Participants

Group	Name*	Courses taught	EMI teaching experience (year)
One	Nani	QMS**	Three
	Susan	QMS	Three
	Budi	Mathematics	Four
	Hasan	Accounting	Two
	Luna	Programming 1	Four
	Asri	Programming	Three
Group	Name	Role	Discipline
Two	Abdul	Director of University	Mechanical Engineering
	Nurul	University Vice Director	Engineering Business
	Saleh	International Office Coordinator	English

*All names of the interviewees used in this article are pseudonyms

**QMS = Quality Management System

Interview transcripts were analysed using thematic analysis. The process followed the steps for qualitative data analysis and interpretation outlined by Creswell (2012): coding, grouping the themes, displaying data, interpreting the

findings, and validating the results. Non-verbatim transcription was used as it captured the fundamental meaning behind the spoken texts. This choice was possible because besides acting as both the moderator and researcher, I was a member of the University. This position enabled me to be familiar with terms and expression used by my fellow academia during the interviews.

Following this step, content analysis, as suggested by Krippendorff (2004), was used for the documents analysis. The results yielded from analysis of interviews were used as guidelines for the content analysis of the documents. This particular analysis involved a first-pass document review, in which meaningful and relevant passages of text or other data were identified. This iterative process included reading for a thorough examination, and making interpretation of the documents.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

University Stakeholders' Perspectives on EMI Practice

Table 2 shows a summary of the results of the focus group discussion in which the two groups of stakeholders consisting of lecturers and authorities discussed their views on the rationales for EMI practice.

Table 2. University Stakeholders' Responses on EMI Practice

Perceptions	FG1	FG2
Rationales for EMI	Students' English skills Graduates' employability Institutional vision for the year of 2020	Students' English skills Graduates' employability Institutional vision for the year 2020 Globalization (MEA) To support international office unit program
Necessary support to be available for EMI	Training of English and EMI teaching skills	The provision of training for EMI lecturers Lack of English lecturers' roles Current curriculum to practice EMI (students' final project) Giving extra reward (incentives) to EMI lecturers

Rationales for EMI

Regarding rationales for EMI practice, as shown in Table 2, there were a majority of aspects shared by both lecturers and the authorities. First, they viewed that one of the reasons to practice EMI at the university was to improve the students' English skills:

To equip the students with English skills, active and passive English are necessary (Nurul/FG2)

The English skills of the students could be increased gradually, they can also explore more about the media and the fields of knowledge, which are presented in English (Budi/FG1)

Even the following lecturer expressed the outcome of practising EMI in their program:

So, as the English (of our students) could be improved, the program (external) assessor said, "Oh (your) diploma students could also communicate in English!" (Nani/FG1)

This particular understanding is connected to another shared view of EMI among these stakeholders, that is, giving benefits for their graduates in the future:

The graduates' opportunity to get jobs is bigger, even when they become entrepreneurs, they can have a wider network (with English skills) (Abdul/FG2)

In addition, it's also based on our concern, our concern for the profession held by students in the future, especially in Accounting, for example, in their professions, when students complete their study, they will be very exposed to English terminologies (Hasan/FG1)

Finally, the stakeholders shared their opinion that EMI practice at the institution was to support the university's vision for 2020:

We are as part of this institution. You know the vision of Utama University to be achieved in 2020, don't you? If this university aspires to be internationally renowned, at least the atmosphere should be nuanced with the English language, English. At least the students would feel that they are already in the university with great access to English language so that they would be committed to improving their English. (Nani/FG1)

To achieve the vision of the institution for 2020 (Nurul/FG2)

To support the vision of the institution for 2020 (Saleh/FG2)

Another reason for EMI practice perceived by the university authorities was globalization (Read: MEA):

English is the most popular and global communication tool (Abdul/FG2)

Another personnel of the institution leaders mentioned a more practical reason:

EMI class is to prepare infra-structure for the students from foreign universities and the university students who plan to go for a student exchange (Saleh/FG2)

While other lecturers said:

It was suggested, especially by the Department head, that we present the learning materials in English (Luna/FG1)

For me, it is more about the demands from the institution. By chance, I like English. Well, the institutions' demand was my reason for EMI (Asri/FG1)

It is important to highlight this particular reason for EMI practice, which is because of the University's recommendation. This particular response will be examined with the findings from document analysis to seek if there is certain written arrangement of EMI at the University.

Necessary Support for EMI

When asked about necessary support to be available for the implementation of EMI in the institution, as Table 2 indicates, university leaders' responses were more varied than those of the lecturers'. One shared perspective that both groups of stakeholders had was training for the lecturers to enable them to perform EMI practice:

The main point is that the content lecturers should be supported, given some facilities (read: training) to improve their English before they teach in English. (Luna/FG1)

They also specifically described the content of training necessary for them:

The training for the opening and closing the lesson meeting. (Susan/FG1)

Training for supporting us that we could maintain our English use in the classroom (Nani/FG1)

One of authorities articulated the idea this way:

Providing some trainings to (EMI) lecturers (Saleh/FG2)

This shared view could be understood by looking at the participant's role as the IOC. His experience across institutions might have contributed to this view:

In some meetings with several universities representatives, some of these issues were raised. (Saleh/FG2).

Another interesting opinion articulated by this same participant:

Giving incentives to the EMI lecturers (Saleh/FG2)

Once again, his experience working at his current role as the coordinator of the University international office might influence his understandings. It is also interesting to relate the view of giving incentives to lecturers, who practise EMI to the challenge perceived by one of the University leaders:

It is hard to engage the lecturers into our programs, there seems missing between the programs. We have provided workshops and seminars and the lecturers seem to lack enthusiasm. As the vice director for public and co-operation matters, I am still trying to find effective ways to engaging the lecturers (into EMI practice). (Nurul/FG2)

However, with this challenging situation expressed by his fellow, the top leader of the university articulated another interesting point on the form of support for EMI:

The human resources, the English lecturers are the embryo, who can improve the language skills through the learning materials (textbooks) and instructional methods (Abdul/FG2)

It is important to note that the university leader considered the importance of the English language specialists' role to provide relevant support for the institution regarding EMI. It is worth comparing this particular issue with the target university current arrangement on English language courses in the institution in the following section.

Another university authority said:

Having final paper written in English in the department curriculum (Nurul/FG2)

The particular expression of the University authority could be examined with one of EMI lecturer, suggesting that this particular arrangement has been done in a (some) department in the institution:

In the Business Department, every year students' final projects are written in English (Nani/FG1)

Despite the positive view on practising EMI in the university, as I mentioned in the introduction of this article, these voluntary EMI programs already ceased to exist. Yet, a number of lecturers still maintained the practice:

I focus on (improving) the students' (English) and I also want to improve myself (through EMI) (Budi/FG1)

For example, now the course I am teaching is not the QMS, but the Entrepreneurship, I still practise using English" (Susan/FG1)

When I teach public relations... the explanation is sometimes in English. So not only in the QMS course do we use English, we also practise it in other courses (Nani/FG1)

In the following section, I present the results from the analysis of each department curriculum at the University. The stakeholders' responses during the interviews were examined with current arrangement in the University curriculum.

EMI Policy Arrangement at the University

The results of document analysis found that the mission statements in the curriculum documents of most study programs at the University were formulated by restating the university mission for the year 2020 in their curriculum document, that is, "By 2020 Utama University becomes the best and the most reliable vocational educational institution in both national and international level", and replacing the institution name with their respective department name. This mission seems to be interpreted by most University stakeholders as the guidelines for EMI practice (see responses of Nani/FG1, Nurul/FG2, and Saleh/FG2). This particular finding also suggests that no written institution

recommendation (see responses of Luna/FG1 and Asri/FG1 regarding the rationale for EMI) is provided in the University curriculum.

Thus, it is necessary to examine the arrangement of English courses within the University due to the top University authority's view on the importance of English language specialists. Table 3 illustrates the curriculum of English courses in each study program of each department.

Table 3. The Structure of English Course in the University Curriculum

Departments	English Course	Description
Civil Engineering and Planning	Diploma 3* English 1b **and English 2c	*Number refers to the number years of the study **Each course is for one semester
Mechanical Engineering	Diploma 4 English 1b and English 2c Diploma 4 English for Engineering 1c English 2c Diploma 3 Englishc Diploma 1 Englishc	abcd is the amount of time of English per week a = 2 x 45minutes b = 3 x 45minutes c = 4 x 45 minutes d = 6 x 45 minutes
Electrical Engineering	Diploma 3 – Electrical English 1c and English 2c Diploma 4 – Electronics English 1a– 6a	
Accounting	Diploma 3 English for Business Communication 1c – 4c Diploma 4 English 1d and English 2c	
Business	Diploma 3 General Englishc Business Speaking Comprehensiond Business Listening Comprehensionc Business Reading and Writing Comprehensiond English Business Correspondencec	
Agricultural	Diploma 3	

Departments	English Course	Description
Technology	English 1d and English 2c English 3a and English 4a Diploma 4 English 1a – 5a	
Fisheries and Oceanography Sciences	Diploma 3 – Fish Cultivation English 1b and English 2c Diploma 3 – Fish Processing English 1b Diploma 3 – Fish Catching English 1c and English 2c English for Maritimesb	
Architecture	Diploma 3	
Engineering and Planning	English 1c and English 2c	

As can be seen on Table 3, all departments offer compulsory English courses. They offer the courses under varied names. Some term the courses as English for Specific Purposes (ESP), such as “English for Engineering”, “English for Maritimes”, and “English for Business Communication”. Others use more general names; for example, “English 1” and “English 2” might refer to “General English”, but English specialists could also practise this CBLT-English course in their English language teaching (ELT) without ESP labels.

Regarding the number of meeting hours of English lesson, there is a variety of settings among the programs within the University. The reasons could be various as well. For example, some programs including Business and Accounting offer the English course in a consecutive two or three years, which is understandable because there is a strong need for English skills (see the response by Hasan/FG1). Furthermore, the study program of Electrical Engineering, which has most English-laden courses such as IT, Programming, seems to signify the need of English to support the program. This description was also mentioned by one of the lecturers:

The course I am teaching has content, which is more in English (Luna/FG1)

Discussion

Perspectives on EMI

Based on the evidence from the group interviews, both groups of stakeholders perceived the importance of English skills for their students and graduates. This particular belief was congruent with findings from some studies (see e.g., Aguilar, 2015; Arnó-Macià & Mancho-Barés, 2015), which found lecturers' perception of benefits of EMI for the students. These stakeholders of the current study believed English is a golden ticket to the global competition for the university graduates.

This positive perception could also be understood as the popularity of English in Science and Technology (Zaaba et al, 2010) and course textbooks (Ammon, 2001). Because of this popularity, learning those disciplines in EMI environment was perceived to be an effective way to improving students' English.

EMI Policy Arrangement

There are two main issues regarding policy arrangement around EMI. First, there is a need for macro level policy to clearly articulate which language and types of regulation to be practised in the classrooms. The lack of clarity in the arrangement of the implementation of EMI seems to be common in several contexts, especially in Asian region. No specific guideline about English to be used as the vehicular language in the university is provided. This case was in line with the study by Ali (2013). Some of the lecturers said that their EMI practice was driven by the university leader's recommendation. This guidance was likely to be conveyed orally (through meetings and speech delivery) because there was no written evidence for this recommendation of EMI practice at the University. This informal arrangement seems to be a common practice among some policy makers in the university, even in a broader context, Indonesia (Nasir, 2015). It is important to highlight that unclear arrangement on medium of instruction has been linked with lack of success in implementing the program (Hamid et al., 2013; Hu & Lei, 2014). Thus, the discontinuation of EMI voluntary programs in the current study is likely to result from this lack of clear arrangement from the policy makers.

Another concern related to EMI policy arrangement was the inconsistency between the stakeholders' perspectives and their arrangement in the institution-

al curriculum. Lecturers and the authorities of the target university agreed to the importance of English for their graduates, thus were supportive of EMI practice. But, this positive perspective was not reflected in the university arrangement, especially of English course structure. This situation could be caused by the practice of top-down policy. Higher education institutions might not be involved in making decisions on the arrangement of University curriculum, in particular regarding EMI. Universities, however, were accountable to implement the policy on EMI.

However, adopting an approach of English for specific purposes within English courses in the target university seems to be highly potential to open up ways to developing possible EMI programs within the university. The application of CBLT approach for ELT within English courses at the target university is worth considering (see the response by Abdul/FG2). The top leader of the university emphasized the important role of English course lecturers in his institution. This perception is linked with the fact that some programs (Accounting, Electrical Engineering) need intensive package of English language learning. This perception suggests some senses. First, within the university, EMI seems to have a bigger potential when presented by English language lecturers. The EMI used by the language specialists is a practice adopting CBLT, or CBI approach. Another sense is that the implementation of this approach would entail providing necessary support, or professional development for English specialists. The findings in the research conducted by Simbolon (2015) suggest that designing learning materials relevant to the discipline areas would be one of the mainly necessary supports given to the English lecturers in the university. All these findings hence suggest a need for a review of the university current curriculum.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusions, the study showed several issues of EMI in the research context. First, there is a shared belief between the lecturers and the university leaders regarding the importance English to improve graduates' skills for global competition. This study has provided evidence of the gap between macro level and a lower level in terms of perceptions on EMI among the stakeholders (policy makers and lecturers). Such a gap has been common practice in many contexts. The disconnection between the top and down level of the University

has resulted in an envisioned goal not being understood by lecturers, and therefore, does not create the intended effective impact in the classroom.

Also, the positive perception of the important role of English specialists and the potential to develop English courses adopting CBLT or CLIL in the university could be one of the agenda of the review of current curriculum in the target university.

Thus, this study suggests that the status quo of EMI at the University has two kinds of practices of EMI—EMI practice by content-specialists and English specialists implementing CBLT, or CBI approach in their English subjects. The latter practice seems to have more potential. In this sense, English language lecturers were considered to be the personnel who practise EMI. Thus, this particular finding suggests a more specific direction of ELT in the University, which is a CBLT, or CBI-based English language teaching. Meanwhile, content specialists practising EMI is de facto, should be understood as one result of the internationalization of higher education in the globe. In this particular sense, a broader review on the University curriculum would be worth taking in the future studies.

Finally, this case study is limited to one state university in a big country, Indonesia. The findings cannot therefore be generalized to all higher educational institutions in the country. Still, other institutions with similar contexts should benefit from the research findings and insights presented in this paper. More studies in similar area in this context are needed to compile the current picture of policy arrangement of EMI in Indonesian higher education.

REFERENCES

- Aguilar, M. (2015). Engineering lecturers' views on CLIL and EMI. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(6), 1-14.
- Airey, J. (2011). Talking about teaching in English: Swedish university lecturers' experiences of changing teaching language. *Ibérica*, 22, 35-54.
- Ali, N. L. (2013). A changing paradigm in language planning: English-medium instruction policy at the tertiary level in Malaysia. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 73-92.

- Ammon, U. (Ed.). (2001). *The dominance of English as a language of science effects on other languages and language communities*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Arnó-Macià, E., & Mancho-Barés, G. (2015). The role of content and language in content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at university: Challenges and implications for ESP. *English for Specific Purposes*, 37, 63-73.
- ASEAN (2015). *ASEAN economic community*. Retrieved from <http://www.asean.org/communities/asean-economic-community>
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol, UK: Tonawanda; NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. 4th ed. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dearden, J. (2015). *English as a medium of instruction—a growing global phenomenon*. Retrieved from <https://www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/knowledge-centre/english-language-higher-education/report-english-medium-instruction>
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2013). *English-medium instruction at universities: Global challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Floris, F. D. (2014). Learning subject matter through English as the medium of instruction: Students' and teachers' perspectives. *Asian Englishes*, 16(1), 47-59.
- Gill, S. K., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2013). English in Asian and European higher education. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1916-1920). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

- Hamid, M. O., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Baldauf Jr., R. B. (2013). Medium of instruction in Asia: Context, processes and outcomes, *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(1), 1–15.
- Hou, A. Y. C., Morse, R., Chiang, C.-L., & Chen, H.-J. (2013). Challenges to quality of English medium instruction degree programs in Taiwanese universities and the role of local accreditors: A perspective of non-English-speaking Asian country. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 14(3), 359-370.
- Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2014). English-medium instruction in Chinese higher education: A case study. *Higher Education*, 67(5), 551–567.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 281-315.
- Joe, Y., & Lee, H.-K. (2013). Does English-medium instruction benefit students in EFL contexts? A case study of medical students in Korea. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 22(2), 201-207.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodologies* (2nd ed.) London, English; New Delhi, India: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2009). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2015). Conceptualising the potential role of L1 in CLIL. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(1), 74-89.
- Nasir, M. (2015, November 30). Bilingual curriculum to be compulsory in universities starting from 2016. *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from <http://m.thejakartapost.com/news/2015/11/30/bilingual-curriculum-be-compulsory-universities-starting-2016.html>
- Simbolon, N. E. (2015). Using the CBI method in teaching English in an Indonesian university. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 23(4), 1211-1224.
- Simbolon, N. E. (2016). *Lecturers' perspectives on English Medium Instruction (EMI) practice in Indonesian higher education*. (Doctoral dissertation, Curtin University, Perth, Australia).

- Simbolon, N. E. (2017). Partial English instruction in English-medium instruction (EMI) practice: Perspectives from lecturers in a university in Indonesia. In J. Valeke & R. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Integrating content and language in higher education: Perspectives on professional practice* (pp. 169-188). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor UU Perguruan Tinggi Tahun 2012 No. 12 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi* [The Law of Higher Education of 2012 Number 12]. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.
- Undang- Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional* [The Law of National Education System of 2003]. Jakarta: Ministry of Education and Culture.
- Wachter, B., & F. Maiworm, F. (2014). English-taught Programmes in European Higher Education. The State of Play in 2014. ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education. Bonn: Lemmens.
- Werther, C., Denver, L., Jensen, C., & Mees, I. M. (2014). Using English as a medium of instruction at university level in Denmark: the lecturer's perspective. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(5), 443-462.
- Yang, W. (2015). Content and language integrated learning next in Asia: Evidence of learners' achievement in CLIL education from a Taiwan tertiary degree programme. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18(4), 361-382.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed. Vol. 5). USA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Zaaba, Z., Aning, I. N. A., Gunggut, H., Ramadan, F. I. M., & Umemoto, K. (2010). English as a medium of instruction in the public higher education institution: A case study of language-in-education policy in Malaysia. *International Journal of Education and Information Technologies*, 2(5), 157-165.